

OFFICE OF

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

RUDOLF NOTHENBERG CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER 289 CITY HALL SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA 94102 415/554-4851

February 8, 1995

The Honorable Frank M. Jordan Mayor Room 200, City Hall San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors Room 235, City Hall San Francisco, CA 94102 INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
MAY 3 1995
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Final Status Report on CAO Projects/Departments Prior To My Retirement

It seems appropriate to provide you with a summary of the status of major functions and projects being managed by the CAO and some thoughts on issues still to be dealt with by whomever will occupy this office on my retirement.

In listing these various items, I want to be very clear that where there are successes they are attributable to my staff, my colleagues and the cooperation of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. Where these are unmet expectations I accept full responsibility for them.

I would like to deal first with the major construction and systems development projects for which my office is responsible, second with the ongoing programs I administer and then with the various departments which report to me. With respect to construction and systems development projects, I will report these in three categories; those which are "mature", that is, well under way to completion, those which are at the mid-point and then those which we have just begun:

A. MATURE PROJECTS

- Main Library Construction: Construction on both interiors and exteriors is proceeding satisfactorily. Furniture/equipment, privately funded, are in the bid process.
 Schedule delays are minor and not problematical. We are struggling daily to keep change orders within the available contingency budget.
- Waterfront Transportation Projects: Proceeding very satisfactorily. The Southern Section (Folsom-3rd Street) Roadway and Muni Metro Extension is complete. The Northern Section (Broadway-North Point) Roadway and "F" Line extension is in construction. The Muni Metro Turnback construction tunneling is proceeding. King Street (3rd to 6th Street) is going to bid in March. Phase I of the Fishermans Wharf loop will soon be in construction. (See also later discussion of Mid-Embarcadero Section).

Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2025 with funding from State of California and California State Library

- Pollution Control Facilities: All Clean-Water projects required by our Cease and Desist orders (CDOs) are either complete or in construction. The new Oceanside Plant went "on line" in late 1993 and is operating satisfactorily. Major CDO mandated projects still in construction and on schedule are the Richmond Transport, the Islais Creek Transport and Rankin St. Pump Station (see however subsequent discussion of reclamation issues).
- <u>Seismic Projects</u>: Various Fire Station and Police Station projects are either complete, in construction or design. One major exception is the Bayview Police Station which we have been unable to award after numerous tries at finding a MBE Prime Contractor. Various smaller General Obligation Bond or Hazard Mitigation Fund supported projects are in construction or completed.

The Fine Arts-Legion of Honor seismic project, partially privately funded is proceeding very well and on schedule. The Civic Auditorium seismic project is in construction and has encountered numerous problems resulting from differences in the original plans for the building and what the contractor discovered in "opening" the walls and on beginning demolition for the installation of new structural steel and shear walls. We have had to significantly augment the budget for this project and reduce the scope of certain non-seismic work in order to complete it on schedule for the 1996 Opera Season. (see later discussion of Civic Center Buildings generally).

B. PROJECTS/PROGRAMS STARTED AND WELL UNDER WAY

- 9-1-1 Project: We have completed the programming and preliminary design for the new building. Final site designation is before the Board of Supervisors for action. We have developed a "high level" requirement definition for the hardware and software to serve the new 9-1-1 Emergency Center and the Police, Fire & EMS vehicles. We need next to secure the commitments of participants to develop detailed specifications satisfactory to all users so that the bid documents can be prepared. A continuing and serious problem remains the lack of funding for OES, the ultimate operator of the combined facility, to begin their operational planning and necessary training. Such OES operational costs cannot be funded by the long term financing we are utilizing for the building and equipment. The CAO's office will undertake the long term financing as required by the cash flows needs of the project.
- 800 Mhz Radio Project: We have lost considerable time due to the ill fated attempt to accomplish this project through a negotiated contract with Motorola. On February 10, 1995 we circulate an RFP for technical consultants who will prepare detailed specifications on which both potential suppliers can bid. We are also recruiting an in-house project manager to provide project oversight. It is essential that this project meets the 9-1-1 project time-lines. The CAO's office will undertake the long term financing as required by the cash flow needs of the project

- Courthouse Construction: The first phase of construction; excavation and shoring, is proceeding extremely well. Construction bids to be released later this year to prequalified (through HRC) bidders. Long-term financing will be undertaken by the CAO's office consistent with schedule requirements for bid award
- Zoo Project: This Bond funded project for replacement of underground utilities is moving satisfactorily though planning and environmental documentation phases with good cooperation from Zoological Society and Recreation and Park Department.
- Golden Gate Park: A Bond funded project for major rehabilitation of Golden Gate
 Park which has to date produced a master plan for the Golden Gate Park. A "costedout" list of rehabilitation projects consistent with the master plan has been provided to
 the Recreation and Park Commission for their decision while we seek necessary
 environmental clearances.
- Waterfront Project: The Mid-Embarcadero section of the Roadway project (Broadway-Folsom) combined with the replacement of the Terminal Separator Structure (off/on ramps to I-80) is awaiting completion of the combined EIS/EIR leading to selection of a "preferred alternative" by the Board of Supervisors. We have provided FHWA and Cal Trans with transportation studies proving that a number of TSS replacement alternatives included in the EIR/EIS will provide the "comparability of accessibility" required by Federal and State law. A major concern here is that the Federal, and particularly the State matching funds which, in the aggregate must pay for construction of the TSS replacement will be available when the City is prepared to go to construction. Both FHWA and Cal Trans have concurred in our Board of Supervisors approved approach to the TSS replacement. We believe this constitutes a commitment to provide the funds (which FHWA/Cal Trans were once willing to spend immediately for a "in kind" replacement) for one of the alternative we are proposing. Our concern is heightened by the fact that both Earthquake Relief funds and transportation funds generally are far short of California's needs and that the Cypress Freeway replacement is being funded by Cal Trans at a far higher level than earlier anticipated.

As to the Mid-Embarcadero Open Space project (for the area in front of the Ferry Building) we have developed a series of design options and funding options, with Redevelopment Agency or a future general obligation bond proposal as the most promising alternatives for financing.

• <u>Seismic Projects</u>: The City Hall construction bid was awarded in February 1995 to Huber, Hunt & Nichols, the low bidder. We anticipate turning over the building to the contractor in early 1995 for a three year period. We are working intensely to secure firm dollar commitments from FEMA and the required matching funds from State OES. It should be noted that FEMA has not agreed to the retrofit scheme (base isolation) recommended by our consultants while State OES agrees with us that our scheme is the only one which meets applicable codes and public safety concerns. The cost difference between our "base isolation" project and the FEMA suggested scheme is, we believe the responsibility of State OES.

The Opera House closure and retrofit has become a much larger project, now including major funding (\$24 million) from the private sector for improvements not fundable by the seismic bonds and for which no other public monies are available from either the Performing Arts Center of the General Fund. The project is fully designed and will go to bid in May 1995. The major issue here is to complete the project in eighteen months (from start of construction in December 1995) so that the Opera Company loses no more than one season and the Ballet Company loses no more than two seasons as tenants of the Opera House. This will require that certain construction work to the done on double shifts. (see subsequent discussion of Civic Center Building funding).

C. PROJECTS RECENTLY STARTED

- Convention Center Expansion: We have completed a study which indicates that we will lose certain of our larger conventions unless we provide more space for their meetings. We are investigating the cost and availability of expansion space close enough to Moscone Convention Center to allow those of our clients who say they would otherwise leave to remain as San Francisco customers, using all of Moscone combined with whatever associated space we could provide nearby. Any expansion would, however, have to attract significant numbers of new hotel room occupancies generated by meetings which cannot now come to our City because existing Moscone is fully booked. We have a financial feasibility study under way to determine the amount of additional hotel room occupancies we could attract, either in a facility closely associated geographically with Moscone or alternatively closer geographically to the North of Market hotel block (if any such site were available). We anticipate having answers to these questions within a matter of months. If there is sufficient economic justification to proceed, we would recommend that the Board of Supervisors impose and dedicate new, additional Hotel Taxes to secure financing for an expansion. A vote of the people in November 1995 would also be required.
- Asian Art Museum Relocation to Civic Center: We have just begun the process of
 developing a MOU between DPW and the Asian Art Commission covering such issues
 as project management, the scope of work, responsibilities of the parties, the method
 of dealing with the private sector funding necessary for the interior modification etc.
- Flood Control and Pollution Control Treatment Plant Rehabilitation: A revenue bond was approved in November 1994. Projects have been identified and cash flow requirements for major components have been developed. We anticipate selling the first installment of revenue bonds in July 1995 so that particular projects can go into design and construction as soon as possible.

We have made various references to projects which will still need to be addressed and for which funding still needs to be secured. I would like to briefly discuss the most critical of them:

- City Hall non seismic work: The bond issue to convert the 3rd and 4th floor of city Hall to office use and to otherwise bring the building up to code in those areas where no seismic work is being done was narrowly defeated in 1994. Unless funds are provided in time to be used during the closure of city Hall, we will return to City Hall with the 3rd and 4th floor largely unusable and with much of the building, while seismically safe, in the same sad shape as is currently the case. I believe another try at a bond issue must be undertaken in November 1995.
- Civic Center Buildings Seismic Work: As we advised the Board in May, 1994 we anticipated a need for an additional sum of some \$43.6 million to complete the seismic retrofit of all Civic Center buildings. Our current estimate of the shortfall, based on our experience in Civic Auditorium and anticipating some double shifting at the Opera House, is in the area of \$50 million. A bond issue to cover these additional need is being prepared and should be submitted to the electorate in time to assure that the Veterans Building retrofit can begin soon after the building is vacated from it's temporary use as a City Hall replacement.
- Other Unfunded Seismic Retrofit Projects: There remain several smaller Recreation and Park facilities and branch libraries which are still rated as #4, the highest seismic vulnerability DPW uses in classifying City buildings. The estimated cost to retrofit these facilities is some \$12 million. We would recommend including these few buildings as part of the Bond issue necessary to complete seismic retrofit of Civic Center buildings as discussed in the immediately preceding paragraph.

DeYoung Museum Seismic Retrofit: With the passage of the bond issue which will (assuming that the required private sector funds are generated) allow the Asian Art Museum) to move to Civic Center, the DeYoung can how complete it's master plan and move a seismic bond issue to the ballot. A decision needs to be made as to whether the existing buildings are to be retrofitted or the proceeds of a bond issue used to provide a new, seismically safe structure.

San Bruno Jail: The jail is in need of major rehabilitation or replacement. Bond issues for that purpose have twice failed.

This list does not include such other major long term financings as may be necessary for the rehabilitation of Juvenile Hall, for whatever is being planned for Laguna Honda, the Mid-Embarcadero Open Space project and other capital needs which will yet emerge. We have at various times pointed out that if we are to stay within the 2.4% "prudent" tax supported Debt/AV limit to which we have heretofore adhered, new credit issued to the market will have to be rationed. It is obvious that we cannot support all of the tax supported debt proposals that will come before CIAC and then the Mayor and Board of Supervisors as decision makers. It continues to be my belief that the highest priority should remain the completion of our seismic retrofit projects.

I would now like to bring you up to date on various issues within program for which my office is responsible:

- Water Pollution Control: A major unresolved issue in completing our adopted Water Pollution Control Master Plan is the question of how to dispose treated water which is now being discharged into the Bay from our Southeast Treatment Plant. It has long been our belief that this is not the best solution for the disposal of this usable water. At the time the master plan was adopted, one proposed solution was to pump the effluent crosstown (in a tunnel) to the Oceanside Plant and Ocean Outfall for discharge into the Ocean. In the meantime, other solutions which would reclaim this water for beneficial use have been developed. The most intriguing of these alternatives is to join with other Bay dischargers to collect the highly treated water from plants ringing the Bay (including our own) and deliver it outside the Bay Area for agricultural use or ground water recharge. DPW and the Water Department are jointly working to prepare Environmental documentation on this and other alternatives including the so called "Crosstown" Tunnel. The Board will be asked to select a preferred alternative when the environmental documentation is completed.
- Solid Waste: While we have initiated a highly successful residential curbside recycling program, we will not reach our state mandated 50% recycling goal (from our current 35% rate) without a major component of commercial recycling. While office paper and glass is being largely removed from the commercial wastestream, other waste components, notably wood products and organics remain serious problems. The removal of organics from the wastestream requires a major composting site, which we have been unable so far to secure in the City. We are continuing to look for a composting facility within the City and are also investigating the co-use of a composting site being developed in Alameda. Further increase in recycling will also require major capital improvements at the transfer station in San Francisco. While a master plan for these improvements has been prepared, we still need to develop a financing scheme which protects the rate payers and the City.

We are also involved in a major negotiation with Waste Management Inc. the operator of our Altamont landfill site to determine the cost sharing formula for past and future EPA required remediation improvements at that site. We are nearing and end to these negotiations and hope to achieve a result consistent with the 1994 order of the Rate Board. We have also begun very preliminary discussions with various operators to determine the availability of additional landfill capacity to meet the City's future needs and the statutory requirements of AB 939. All of these issues will have major impacts on garbage rates and are further complicated by the fact that the City has no legal authority to regulate commercial rates.

<u>Unreinforced Masonry Building Program</u>: This program is now fully staffed. The first increment of \$35 million of bonds have been sold and we are responding to owners interested in using our loan program. We hope to make the first loans early in 1995. Our staff is working with the new Department of Building Inspection to secure their help in assuring that we will meet programmatic goals of the ordinance.



Mission Bay: We have made much progress in completing various of the ancillary agreements (Land Transfers, Port, Transportation) and legal documents leading to "initial closure" which is anticipated early this year. Catellus has however not been able to provide the Financial Assurance required by the Development Agreement to assure toxic remediation and, while we have done much work on the formulation of the Community Facilities District, the CFD which would provide project infrastructure financing has not yet been created. We are awaiting a strategic decision by Catellus on land uses north of China Basin where the once contemplated offices uses are no longer feasible. Once Catellus has decided on a course of action, we anticipate a major re-negotiation of elements of the approved Development Agreement, as before, under the joint auspices of the CAO and Planning Director with assistance from the City Attorney. Any proposed major amendments to the Development Agreement would come before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in 1995 on recommendation from the City's negotiating team.

Moscone Convention Center: The CAO's office together with the Redevelopment Agency and the support of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors successfully sold the bonds allowing for construction of the Children Center in the roof of Moscone South. This construction should start soon. Moscone South is fully booked during the anticipated construction period. Our clients who used the facility during earlier construction on the roof of Moscone South and the construction on the roof of Moscone North, experienced significant construction related interruption and interference, to the extent that we had to make numerous refunds of rentals paid. We are fashioning an operating MOU with the Redevelopment Agency in a joint effort to minimize aggravations to San Francisco's clients during the Children Center construction on the roof of an operating convention center. We will need the continued goodwill of the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and Redevelopment Agency to assure that San Francisco's most important economic activity is not negatively impacted by the ensuing construction.

Hotel Tax/Grants for the Arts: This is the major public funding source for the vast majority of San Francisco's non-profit cultural organizations, large and small. The Fund has been frozen for two years which meant that no cultural organization received an increase and no new organizations could be funded. Many of these same organizations now face the loss of their NEA grants as Congress threatens to defund the Arts Endowment. It is important that the Hotel Tax Grants for the Arts not be frozen for a third year in a row just as it is essential that the new CAO keep the Grants program a general operating support program for all qualified organizations and free of special interest pressures.

Finally, with respect to the eleven departments which report to the CAO. It is my sincere opinion that the small General Fund supported agencies such as the Coroner, Animal Control, Public Guardian, Telecommunications, Purchasing etc. have, over the years absorbed all the cuts they can absorb and still stay functional. For the eight years which I have supervised these agencies I have, knowing first hand the budget problems faced by any mayor who has to balance a budget, gone along with cuts for these small units as requested by successive Mayors. At the Board of Supervisors hearings we have always agreed to any proposed cuts which seemed at all substantiable. Over these eight years I have not whined, not complained, and not come back for supplementals for overspending our appropriations.

Enough is, however, enough. In preparing budgets for this year I have not forced these 10 small departments which in the aggregate require less than \$13 million of General Fund Support to deciminate their budgets for 1995. Departments that small, all of whom moreover perform mandated County functions or support the needs of other service delivery functions of the city do not have the flexibility to absorb 15-20% cuts in their operating budgets and continue to function. I hope that the Mayor and Board will see fit to agree with that truth.

The biggest of the Departments which report to me, the Department of Public Works with a operating budget of some \$171 million is fortunately not reliant on General Fund support. Less than 5% of the budget is General Fund supported and that all goes for street cleaning and related costs. The major component of DPW's expenditure budget is for Water Pollution Control (46% of DPW's budget) and is supported by the Sewer Service charge. We are pleased to advise that the rate increase we will be requesting is entirely within and consistent with the five year Revenue Plan earlier adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

I would be happy to discuss any of the foregoing with you before my retirement in whatever setting you might choose and at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Rudolf Nothenberg

Chief Administrative Officer

